Appln. No.	:	10/821,082	Confirmation No. 1136
Applicant	:	POLAN	
Filed	:	08 April 2004	
TC/A.U.	:	4152	
Examiner	:	GREENE, JOSEPH L.	
Docket No.	:	CA920030071US1	

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
VIA EFS-WEB FILING
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant submits herewith a summary of the telephonic interview conducted with the Examiner on 20 October 2008 (hereinafter the "Interview") pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.133(b) and requests this Summary be made of record within the Application pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

The Applicant requested a telephonic Interview upon review of the Advisory Action of 20 August 2008 in order to further discuss the prior art referenced by the Examiner within the Final Office Action of 22 July 2008 as listed below:

1. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2004/0098447 to Verbeke, *et al.* (hereinafter "Verbeke");

2. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2005/0050382 to Beeston, *et al.* (hereinafter "Beeston"); and

3. "SETI@Home, an Experiment in Public-Resource Computing" by D.P. Anderson, *et al.* (hereinafter "Anderson").

Applicant's representative, Scott M. Garrett, as well as Examiners Joseph L. Green and Hassan Phillips, were participants of the telephonic interview, which was conducted on 20 October 2008.

Verbeke shows a distributed, heterogeneous computing system using peer to peer based organization. It is not a conventional "grid" system, but the claim limitations for which Verbeke was cited recite fairly well known grid computing elements. Applicant's believe a significant point of novelty of the invention is that, when a client fails to return a result for its assigned task

portion, the grid manager approximates the result which would have been provided had the client not failed to return its result.

The Rejection cited Beeston as showing this approximation. However, Applicant finds that what Beeston shows is a system which writes data to a storage device which has a buffer, and if the storage device fails to write from its buffer to the destination medium, the data must be recovered from the buffer by estimating the data block size at the sending computer so that the data block can be copied into a local memory space having a size equal to the estimated data block size.

Applicant's representative discussed that Beeston was not approximating results which would have been produced by a client, and that the estimation of a data block size was not the same or similar. The Examiners conceded to seeing this point, but would not agree that Beeston was not showing results as claimed, although the Examiners could not give any additional clarification or rationale. Applicant maintains the previously made argument that Beeston does not show approximating a processing result as claimed.

Beeston was also cited for showing that the manager was informed of the failure. Applicant's representative reasserted that Beeston actually does not state how the sending computer is made aware of the buffer write failure. Conventionally, this may be performed using a device interrupt, but there is no mention at all as to how the failure occurrence is notified to the computer. As Applicant understood the Examiner, the Examiner inferred that the destination node must be sending a message to the computer that the destination node failed. The claims, however, recite that the message from the client indicates that the results will not be forthcoming.

The SETI@home reference, Anderson, was cited by the Examiner to show using results obtained from a client during a previous cycle. Applicant's representative argued that Anderson shows redundant processing, but not cyclic processing. Anderson assigns the same task portion (data block) to multiple client machines in case one fails to return a result. This is not the same as using results obtained from the failed client during a previous cycle where the client did not fail to return results.

The Interview was conducted with the goal of achieving an indication of allowable subject matter for amending the claim in continued prosecution through the imposition of one or more limitations taught by the invention through the amending of the claims in order to clearly distinguish the invention over the cited references and any other known art. Applicant is submitting concurrently herewith a Request for Continued Examination and Supplemental Response to the Final Office Action on 22 July 2008. Amendments to the claims are presented within the Supplemental Response; Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

The Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned (**954-745-0374**) if clarification is needed on any matter within this Summary, or if the Examiner believes an additional telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 OCT 2008

_____/SCOTT M. GARRETT/_____
Scott M. Garrett, Registration No. 39,988
PATENTS ON DEMAND
Customer No. 57736
4581 Weston Road, Suite 345
Weston, FL 33331
Telephone: (954) 745-0374